Hierarchical $\mathcal{H}_2$ Control of Large-Scale Network Dynamic Systems

Nan Xue, *Student Member, IEEE*, Aranya Chakrabortty, *Senior Member, IEEE*

arXiv:1703.07393v1 [cs.SY] 21 Mar 2017

***Abstract*—In this paper we present a hierarchical, constrained $\mathcal{H}_2$ optimal control design for large-scale network dynamic systems. When such networks have millions of heterogeneous subsystems that are spread across wide geographical spans, the design of conventional $\mathcal{H}_2$ optimal controllers becomes unscalable, and their implementation requires a large number of communication links. Our proposed design bypasses these difficulties by proposing a generic hierarchical control structure that satisfies the quadratic invariance condition, and requires far less communication links for implementation. Due to quadratic invariance, the original constrained design admits a convex reformulation in Youla domain, and can be converted into an unconstrained standard $\mathcal{H}_2$ problem. We show that the same reformulated $\mathcal{H}_2$ controller preserves the hierarchical structure, and enables applications of conventional unstructured model and controller reduction techniques. Two reduction techniques are presented. Scalability properties of the proposed designs are verified by simulations.**

***Index Terms*—Optimal Control, Quadratic Invariance, Network Systems, Controller Reduction.**

I. Introduction

Driven by recent advances in cyber-physical systems, control synthesis for large-scale network dynamic systems has become an increasingly prevalent topic in the control and network communities [1]. Physical networks such as power systems, wireless sensor networks, or the recently emerging internet-of-things consist of numerous heterogeneous subsystems that may be defined across complex topologies and wide geographical spans. The typical number of subsystems in these networks can scale from thousands to millions, making the design of tractable control mechanisms very challenging. To tackle the curse of dimension, traditional model reduction-based techniques such as singular perturbations [2], balanced truncation [3], and controller reduction [4] have been developed decades ago to facilitate the analysis and control of large-scale systems, in general. However, these techniques are not readily applicable to networks as their control schemes are mostly unstructured, and hence agnostic of the network topology that contains important constraints for both design and implementation. One such pertinent constraint is communication. For example, conventional feedback controllers such as $\mathcal{H}_2$ optimal controllers are defined over unstructured dense transfer matrices, and thus implementing this control would necessitate an impractically large number of communication links for even a moderately sized network.

N. Xue and A. Chakrabortty are with the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, North Carolina State University, Raleigh, NC, 27695 USA, e-mail: nxue@ncsu.edu, achakra2@ncsu.edu

The work is supported partly by the US National Science Foundation (NSF) under grant ECCS 1054394.

Starting from the idea of decentralized control by Siljak [5], several seminal papers have developed design tools to impose desired implementation structure on controllers. One of them, the work in [6], states that a decentralized optimal control admits a convex reformulation in Youla domain if the structural constraint on the controller is quadratic invariant (QI) under the plant model. Built around quadratic invariance, papers including [6], [7] and [8] incorporate sparsity structures in the controller, aiming to reduce the communication density and to cope with delays. The restriction of these designs, however, is that the sparsity pattern meeting the QI condition is highly dependent on the sparsity of the open-loop network, and therefore, the choice of sparsity can be limited. Moreover, the design complexities of these controllers are dictated by the order of the open-loop plant, and thus can become unscalable for very large-scale networks. A suboptimal design is proposed in [9] to generalize the choice of sparsity structure by relaxation algorithms using l_1-weighted norm. The design, however, is still computationally demanding.

Motivated by these challenges, in this paper we present a hierarchical $\mathcal{H}_2$ control framework that not only facilitates implementation, but is also generic enough to consummate conventional model and controller reduction techniques that allow for the design complexity to reduce significantly. The implementation mechanism of the proposed controller is as follows. Selected network subsystems send their output measurements to a designated set of coordinators. These coordinators take the average of these measurements, and exchange the information between themselves to generate a $\mathcal{H}_2$ control law. Each coordinator, thereafter, broadcasts this control signal to its respective set of nodes. The overall execution is, therefore, completely hierarchical. Fundamental work incorporating this hierarchy has been proposed in our recent paper [10] for a LQG controller built upon the idea of clustering based projection. However, the design there is restricted by the choice of certain design parameters that guarantee closed-loop stability. In this paper we formalize the design in [10] into a general $\mathcal{H}_2$ control problem, where such restrictions do not exist. The hierarchical structure is proven to meet the QI condition irrespective of the structure of the plant, as a result of which, the control problem is reformulated as a standard unconstrained $\mathcal{H}_2$ control. The controller preserves the hierarchical structure inside its input and output matrices, and enables us to simplify its design using conventional unstructured model and controller reduction techniques such as approximate solutions of the underlying algebraic Riccati equations (ARE), as proposed in [11]. The resulting controller, therefore, achieves simplifications in both design and imple-

mentation. The recent paper [12] also addresses both goals using receding-horizon control, but the scalability of their controller is subject to the sparsity structure of the open-loop network. Related hierarchical designs have been proposed in [13], [14], however, they do not exploit the benefit of convex reformulation provided by quadratic invariance.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. Section II defines the hierarchical constraint, and formulates the problem of hierarchical $\mathcal{H}_2$ control. The same problem is parameterized and reformulated into an unconstrained $\mathcal{H}_2$ control via quadratic invariance in Section III. Section IV presents two reduction techniques to simplify the design of the optimal hierarchical controller. Validations of our proposed designs are illustrated via simulations of large-scale power system networks in Section V. Section VI concludes the paper and presents some future works.

Notation The following notations will be used throughout this paper: $|\mathcal{I}|_c$: cardinality of a set $\mathcal{I}$, $diag(m)$: diagonal matrix with vector m on its principal diagonal, $diag(M,N)$: block-diagonal matrix with matrices M and N on its principal diagonal, $tr(M)$: trace operation on a matrix M, $\|M\|_F$: Frobenius norm of a matrix M, i.e. $\|M\|_F = \sqrt{tr(MM^T)}$. A transfer matrix is defined as $g(s) = C(sI-A)^{-1}B + D$, with a realization form of $g(s) = \left[\begin{array}{c|c} A & B \\ \hline C & D \end{array}\right]$. $\mathbb{R}_{sp}$ denotes the set of real-rational strictly proper transfer matrices, and $\mathcal{RH}_\infty$ denotes the set of real-rational proper stable transfer matrices. Furthermore, the $\mathcal{H}_2$ norm of a strictly proper stable transfer matrix $g(s)$ is defined by $\|g(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}_2} = \sqrt{\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} tr[g^*(t)g(t)]\mathrm{d}t} = \sqrt{\frac{1}{2\pi}\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} tr[g^*(j\omega)g(j\omega)]\mathrm{d}\omega}$.

II. Problem Formulation

We motivate our design from the standard formulation of $\mathcal{H}_2$ optimal control. Consider a transfer function matrix $G(s)$ in a realization form

$$G(s) = \begin{bmatrix} G_{11} & G_{12} \\ G_{21} & G_{22} \end{bmatrix} = \left[\begin{array}{c|cc} A & B_1 & B_2 \\ \hline C_1 & 0 & D_{12} \\ C_2 & D_{21} & 0 \end{array}\right], \quad (1)$$

where G_{22} is the plant model with $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$, $B_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n_u}$ and $C_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{n_y\times n}$. In this paper, we consider G_{22} to be defined over $n_s \leq n$ interconnected subsystems with each modeled by

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x}_i(t) &= A_{ii}x_i(t) + \sum_{i\neq j}^{n_s} A_{ij}x_j(t) + B_{2,ii}u_i(t) \\ y_i(t) &= C_{2,ii}x_i(t), \quad i = 1,...,n_s \end{aligned}, \quad (2)$$

where A_{ii}, $B_{2,ii}$ and $C_{2,ii}$ are submatrices with compatible dimensions from A, $B_2 = diag(B_{2,11},...,B_{2,n_sn_s})$ and $C_2 = diag(C_{2,11},...,C_{2,n_sn_s})$. Note that for $n_y, n_u \leq n$, $B_{2,ii}$ and $C_{2,ii}$ can be null matrices, that is, a subsystem can have no input or output. Consider a standard $\mathcal{H}_2$ control for $G(s)$. We assume that (A,B_2) is stabilizable and (C_2,A) is detectable, and both $D_{21}D_{21}^T$ and $D_{12}^TD_{12}$ are nonsingular. The pairs (A,B_1) and (C_1,A) are assumed to have no uncontrollable or unobservable modes on the imaginary axis. Without loss of generality, we also assume $D_{12}^TC_1 = 0$ and $B_1D_{21}^T = 0$ for ease of presentation. Our proposed design is still valid if this assumption is removed. Let $K(s) \in \mathbb{R}_{sp}^{n_u\times n_y}$ denote the controller of interest. The lower linear fractional transformation (LFT) of $G(s)$ and $K(s)$ is defined by

$$f(G,K) := G_{11} + G_{12}K(I - G_{22}K)^{-1}G_{21}. \quad (3)$$

With these notations, the constrained $\mathcal{H}_2$ optimal control problem considered in this paper can be posed as

$$\begin{aligned} \text{minimize} \quad & \|f(G,K)\|_{\mathcal{H}_2} \\ \text{subject to} \quad & K \text{ stabilizes } G, \\ & K \in \mathcal{S} \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where $\mathcal{S} \in \mathbb{R}_{sp}^{n_u\times n_y}$ represents the subset of all strictly proper transfer function matrices that satisfy certain structural constraints. Note that when $\mathcal{S} = \mathbb{R}_{sp}^{n_u\times n_y}$, (4) becomes the unconstrained $\mathcal{H}_2$ design. In practice, the unconstrained case usually yields a controller defined over a dense transfer function matrix. As a result, implementation of this controller for any large-scale network dynamic systems where n, n_u and n_y may scale up to millions, would necessitate an impractically large number of communication links. To bypass this challenge, in this paper we propose a hierarchical structure for the constraint $\mathcal{S}$, that can significantly simplify the implementation of $K(s)$. Another advantageous property of this structure is that it allows (4) to be reformulated as a convex optimization problem as will be unfolded in Section III. The basic mechanism behind the hierarchical formulation is the partitioning of subsystems into a set of non-overlapping groups or *clusters*. This grouping strategy can be completely arbitrary, and is not necessarily dictated by any system property. The constraint $\mathcal{S}$ for this hierarchy can then be formulated as follows.

Definition II.1. *Given the index set of sub-systems as $\mathcal{V} = \{1,...,n_s\}$, and an integer r, where $0 < r \leq n_s$, define r non-empty, distinct, and non-overlapping subsets of $\mathcal{V}$ respectively denoted as $\mathcal{I} = \{\mathcal{I}_1,...,\mathcal{I}_r\}$, such that $\mathcal{I}_1 \cup ... \cup \mathcal{I}_r = \mathcal{V}$. We denote the collection of subsystems in $\mathcal{I}_i$, $i = 1,...,r$ as a cluster.*

We next define two structured projection matrices P_u and P_y for clusters $\mathcal{I}_1,...,\mathcal{I}_r$ as follows.

Definition II.2. *Given the input index set $\mathcal{V}_u$=$\{1,...,n_u\}$, define r non-overlapping and non-empty subsets denoted as $\mathcal{I}^u = \{\mathcal{I}_1^u,...,\mathcal{I}_r^u\}$, such that $\mathcal{I}_i^u$ includes indices of all the inputs in cluster $\mathcal{I}_i$ for $i = 1,...,r$. The input projection matrix $P_u \in \mathbb{R}^{r\times n_u}$ is defined by*

$$P_{u,[ij]} := \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\sqrt{|\mathcal{I}_i^u|_c}}, & j \in \mathcal{I}_i^u \\ 0, & \textit{otherwise} \end{cases}, \quad (5)$$

for $i = 1,...,r$ and $j = 1,...,n_u$. The output projection matrix P_y is defined in the same way by output index set $\mathcal{V}_y$=$\{1,...,n_y\}$ and subsets $\mathcal{I}^y = \{\mathcal{I}_1^y,...,\mathcal{I}_r^y\}$.

Based on the projections P_u and P_y, the constrained subspace $\mathcal{S}$ of all hierarchical controllers can be formally stated as follows.

Definition II.3. *The subspace $\mathcal{S} \in \mathbb{R}_{sp}^{n_u\times n_y}$ admits a hierarchical structure defined over projection matrices $P_u \in \mathbb{R}^{r\times n_u}$*



(a) Step 1 - Output averaging *(b) Step 2 - Lower-dimensional control* *(c) Step 3 - Control inversion*

Figure -1: Hierarchical architecture for implementing any controller in $\mathcal{S}$.

and $P_y \in \mathbb{R}^{r\times n_y}$ if there exists a lower-dimensional transfer matrix $\tilde{S} \in \mathbb{R}^{r\times r}_{sp}$ such that

$$\mathcal{S} = P_u^T \tilde{S} P_y. \tag{6}$$

The controllers in $\mathcal{S}$ contains the projection structures of P_y and P_u, which lead to a sequential two-layer hierarchical control architecture. We illustrate this architecture along with the implementation of controllers in $\mathcal{S}$ by the following example.

Example 1. *Consider a networked system shown in the bottom layer of Fig. -1, where four subsystems are indexed by $\mathcal{V} = \{1,2,3,4\}$, and are connected by a simple line graph. All four subsystems are assumed to have scalar outputs, and only the first three are equipped with inputs, i.e. $\mathcal{V}_y = \{1,2,3,4\}$ and $\mathcal{V}_u = \{1,2,3\}$. The system is partitioned into two clusters $\mathcal{I}_1 = \{1,2\}$ and $\mathcal{I}_2 = \{3,4\}$. Then given $\mathcal{I}_1^u = \{1,2\}$, $\mathcal{I}_2^u = \{3\}$, $\mathcal{I}_1^y = \{1,2\}$ and $\mathcal{I}_2^y = \{3,4\}$, the projection matrices can be constructed as*

$$P_u = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \; P_y = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Let $\tilde{S} = \begin{bmatrix} s_1 & s_2 \\ s_3 & s_4 \end{bmatrix}$, the hierarchical subspace $\mathcal{S}$ follows

$$\mathcal{S} = P_u^T \tilde{S} P_y = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{s_1}{2} & \frac{s_1}{2} & \frac{s_2}{\sqrt{2}} \\ \frac{s_1}{2} & \frac{s_1}{2} & \frac{s_2}{\sqrt{2}} \\ \frac{s_3}{2} & \frac{s_3}{2} & \frac{s_4}{\sqrt{2}} \\ \frac{s_3}{2} & \frac{s_3}{2} & \frac{s_4}{\sqrt{2}} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Therefore, to implement the controller in $\mathcal{S}$, we designate two coordinators one for each cluster. These are denoted as O_1 and O_2 in Fig. -1. The implementation of $\mathcal{S}$ can then be shown by the following three steps with illustrations in Fig. -1.

- *Step 1 - Output averaging ($\bar{y} = P_y y$): Each coordinator receives output measurements from its clustered outputs, and computes the averaged output $\bar{y}_i = \sum_{j\in\mathcal{I}_i^y} \frac{y_i}{\sqrt{|\mathcal{I}_i^y|_c}}$ for $i = 1,...,r$.*
- *Step 2 - Lower-dimensional control ($\bar{u} = \tilde{S}\bar{y}$): Next, the coordinators communicate with each other, and exchange the averaged outputs $\bar{y}_i$, $i = 1,...,r$. Each coordinator then computes a lower-dimensional $\mathcal{H}_2$ control input $\bar{u}_i = \tilde{S}_{i,:}\bar{y}$, $i = 1,...,r$ in a distributed manner.*
- *Step 3 - Control inversion ($u = P_u^T \bar{u}$): In the final step, each coordinator broadcasts the control signal u to subsystems in its cluster by a simple scaling of $\bar{u}_i$, $i = 1,...,r$.*

By applying such a hierarchical structure, the total number of communication links required for implementing the control would be at most $n_s + \binom{r}{2}$. This can be much cheaper than $\binom{n_s}{2}$ required for the all-to-all communication in unstructured controllers. This structure also fits many common cyber physical networks such as power systems where the subsystems may represent synchronous generators and loads, the clusters may represent utility companies, and coordinators may represent the control centers of each respective company. The proposed hierarchical implementation can also preserve data privacy between coordinators as only an averaged output $\bar{y}$ is shared between them. Therefore, no coordinator can infer the output measurements from subsystems assigned to other coordinators.

Compared to [10], where the LQG design is facilitated by only a single output projection matrix, the hierarchy in $\mathcal{S}$ is defined over both input and output projections. We next present the main results of this paper, starting with the convex reformulation for the constrained design (4).

III. Convex Reformulation by Quadratic Invariance

In this section, we present the convex reformulation for the hierarchical $\mathcal{H}_2$ problem (4) facilitated by the quadratic invariant property of $\mathcal{S}$. The following well-known results of Youla parameterization will be used to unfold the solution.

Theorem III.1. *[15] Let F and L be such that $A + LC_2$ and $A + B_2F$ are stable. Then all controllers that internally stabilize $G(s)$ can be parameterized by*

$$K(s) = f(J, Q), \tag{7}$$

with any $Q \in \mathcal{RH}_\infty$ and J defined as

$$J = \left[\begin{array}{c|cc} A + B_2F + LC_2 & -L & B_2 \\ \hline F & 0 & I \\ -C_2 & I & 0 \end{array}\right]. \tag{8}$$

Furthermore, the closed-loop transfer function equals to

$$f(G, K) = T_{11} + T_{12}QT_{21}, \tag{9}$$

where T is given by

$$T = \begin{bmatrix} T_{11} & T_{12} \\ T_{21} & T_{22} \end{bmatrix} = \left[\begin{array}{cc|cc} A + B_2F & -B_2F & B_1 & B_2 \\ 0 & A + LC_2 & B_1 + LD_{21} & 0 \\ \hline C_1 + D_{12}F & -D_{12}F & 0 & D_{12} \\ 0 & C_2 & D_{21} & 0 \end{array}\right]. \tag{10}$$

Given a nominal stabilizing controller J, and the resulting T_{11}, T_{12} and T_{21} from Theorem III.1, one can rewrite the original $\mathcal{H}_2$ problem (4) into a model matching problem with respect to the Youla parameter Q as

$$\begin{array}{ll} \text{minimize} & \|T_{11} - T_{12}QT_{21}\|_{\mathcal{H}_2} \\ \text{subject to} & Q \in \mathcal{RH}_\infty \\ & K(s) = f(J,Q) \in \mathcal{S} \end{array}. \tag{11}$$

Note that $K(s) = f(J,Q) \in \mathcal{S}$ is not an affine constraint of Q in general. However, it has been shown in [6] that $K \in \mathcal{S}$ is equivalent to the affine constraint $Q \in \mathcal{S}$ in Youla domain if the subspace $\mathcal{S}$ is quadratic invariant under the plant model G_{22}. We introduce the notion of quadratic invariance according to [6] as follows.

Definition III.2. *The subspace $\mathcal{S}$ is called quadratic invariant under G_{22} if $KG_{22}K \in \mathcal{S}$ for all $K \in \mathcal{S}$.*

From this definition, it can be easily verified that for any controller $K = P_u^T \tilde{K} P_y \in \mathcal{S}$, quadratic invariance holds for our hierarchical constraint $\mathcal{S}$ under G_{22} given that

$$KG_{22}K = P_u^T(\tilde{K}P_yG_{22}P_u^T\tilde{K})P_y \in \mathcal{S}$$

with $\tilde{K}P_yG_{22}P_u^T\tilde{K} \in \mathbb{R}_{sp}^{r\times r}$. As $K \in \mathcal{S}$ is equivalent to $Q \in \mathcal{S}$, (11) becomes

$$\begin{array}{ll} \text{minimize} & \|T_{11} - T_{12}QT_{21}\|_{\mathcal{H}_2} \\ \text{subject to} & Q \in \mathcal{RH}_\infty,\ Q \in \mathcal{S} \end{array}. \tag{12}$$

To this end, we can find the optimal solution for (4) as follows.

Theorem III.3. *The constrained $\mathcal{H}_2$ problem (11) is equivalent to the following standard $\mathcal{H}_2$ problem*

$$\begin{array}{ll} \text{minimize} & \|f(\bar{G},\bar{K})\|_{\mathcal{H}_2} \\ \text{subject to} & \bar{K} \textit{ stabilizes } \bar{G} \end{array} \tag{13}$$

where

$$\bar{G} = \left[\begin{array}{c|cc} A & B_1 & B_2P_u^T \\ \hline C_1 & 0 & D_{12}P_u^T \\ P_yC_2 & P_yD_{21} & 0 \end{array}\right], \tag{14}$$

and the optimal hierarchical controller K_{opt} can be found by

$$K_{opt} = P_u^T\bar{K}P_y. \tag{15}$$

Proof. Denote $R_1 = P_uD_{12}^TD_{12}P_u^T$ and $R_2 = P_yD_{21}D_{21}^TP_y^T$. The controller K_{opt} can be written

$$K_{opt} = \left[\begin{array}{c|c} A + B_2P_u^TF_2 + L_2P_yC_2 & -L_2P_y \\ \hline P_u^TF_2 & 0 \end{array}\right], \tag{16}$$

with $F_2 := -R_1^{-1}P_uB_2^TX$ and $L_2 := -SC_2^TP_y^TR_2^{-1}$. The matrices $X = X^T \succeq 0$ and $S = S^T \succeq 0$ are solutions of the algebraic Riccati equation (ARE)

$$A^TX + XA + C_1^TC_1 - XMX = 0, \tag{17}$$

and its dual

$$AS + SA^T + B_1B_1^T - SM_sS = 0, \tag{18}$$

where $M = B_2P_u^TR_1^{-1}P_uB_2^T$ and $M_s = C_2^TP_y^TR_2^{-1}P_yC_2$. Note that since (A,B_2) is stabilizable and (C_2,A) is detectable, it can be easily verified by PBH test that $(A, B_2P_u^T)$ is stabilizable and (P_yC_2, A) is detectable given P_y and P_u with full row rank. Therefore, according to [15] the ARE solutions X and S are guaranteed to exist, and are also stabilizing, i.e. $A + B_2P_u^TF_2$ and $A + L_2P_yC_2$ are both Hurwitz.

Next, consider problem (12). From Equation (6), it follows that there exists a $\tilde{Q} \in \mathbb{R}^{r\times r}$ such that $Q = P_u^T\tilde{Q}P_y$. The constraint $Q \in \mathcal{S}$ can then be incorporated into the objective function as

$$\begin{array}{ll} \text{minimize} & \|T_{11} + T_{12}P_u^T\tilde{Q}P_yT_{21}\|_{\mathcal{H}_2} \\ \text{subject to} & \tilde{Q} \in \mathcal{RH}_\infty \end{array}. \tag{19}$$

Consider the nominal controller $J(s)$ in (8) to be K_{opt}. the objective function in (19) is then equivalent to $\|\bar{T}_{11} + \bar{T}_{12}\tilde{Q}\bar{T}_{21}\|_{\mathcal{H}_2}$, where $\bar{T}$ is defined by

$$\bar{T} := \begin{bmatrix} \bar{T}_{11} & \bar{T}_{12} \\ \bar{T}_{21} & \bar{T}_{22} \end{bmatrix} = \left[\begin{array}{cc|cc} A+B_2P_u^TF_2 & -B_2P_u^TF_2 & B_1 & B_2P_u^T \\ 0 & A+L_2P_yC_2 & B_1+L_2P_yD_{21} & 0 \\ \hline C_1+D_{12}P_u^TF_2 & -D_{12}P_u^TF_2 & 0 & D_{12}P_u^T \\ 0 & P_yC_2 & P_yD_{21} & 0 \end{array}\right].$$

It can be easily verified by Theorem III.1 that $\bar{T}_{11}+\bar{T}_{12}\tilde{Q}\bar{T}_{21} = f(\bar{G},\bar{K})$ for $\tilde{Q} = 0$. This concludes the proof. □

From Theorem III.3, the hierarchical $\mathcal{H}_2$ control in (4) is reformulated into the unconstrained $\mathcal{H}_2$ problem (13), for which standard solutions can be obtained from the two AREs (17) and (18). Moreover, the hierarchical structure is now preserved into the input and output projection matrices only, and hence is invariant to any unstructured reduction techniques applied to $\bar{K}$. Given this general form of (13), in the next section we apply conventional model and controller reduction techniques to simplify the design of the optimal controller K_{opt}.

IV. Simplifying the Design of K_{opt}

Constructing the optimal controller K_{opt} requires two matrices X and S from the main ARE (17) and its dual (18). To illustrate the solutions for X and S, we define the Hamiltonian matrices corresponding to (17) and (18) as

$$H := \begin{bmatrix} A & -M \\ -C_1^TC_1 & -A^T \end{bmatrix},\ H_s := \begin{bmatrix} A^T & -M_s \\ -B_1B_1^T & -A \end{bmatrix}. \tag{20}$$

The eigenvalues of H and H_s are both symmetric about the imaginary axis. Suppose that H is diagonalizable and that the columns of the matrix $\begin{bmatrix} Y \\ Z \end{bmatrix}_{2n\times n}$ span the stable invariant subspace of H, i.e.

$$H\begin{bmatrix} Y \\ Z \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} Y \\ Z \end{bmatrix}\Lambda^-, \tag{21}$$

and $\Lambda^- = diag([\lambda_1^-, ..., \lambda_n^-])$ consists of all the eigenvalues of H in the left-half plane. The matrix X can then be found

by $X = ZY^{-1}$ [15]. The same procedure also applies for $S = Z_s Y_s^{-1}$ with

$$H_s \begin{bmatrix} Y_s \\ Z_s \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} Y_s \\ Z_s \end{bmatrix} \Lambda_s^-, \tag{22}$$

where $\Lambda^- = diag([\lambda_{s,1}^-, ..., \lambda_{s,n}^-])$. However, computing the full stable eigenspaces above is subject to $\mathcal{O}(n^3)$ complexity, and thus is not scalable for a large network. In order to make our hierarchical design applicable, we next consider the problem of finding approximate and computationally simpler solutions for X and S, respectively noted as $\bar{X}$ and $\bar{S}$. Given the same rationale behind the solution of X and S, we will illustrate the results based on X only.

A. Design-Specified Reduction

We first introduce a simple case where the matrix C_1 can be chosen to impose a low-rank structure on X so that its computation is naturally reducible. In this case, there is no approximation involved as $\bar{X} = X$. Assume A to be symmetric, and denote its eigenvalue decomposition by

$$A = V\Lambda V^T = \begin{bmatrix} V_1 & V_2 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \Lambda_1 & \\ & \Lambda_2 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} V_1^T \\ V_2^T \end{bmatrix}, \tag{23}$$

where matrices $V_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times\kappa}$ and $\Lambda_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{\kappa\times\kappa}$ are arbitrary partitions from V and Λ. The simplified low-rank solution for (17) can then be obtained as follows.

Theorem IV.1. *If $C_1^T \in span(V_1)$, X is given by*

$$X = V_1 \tilde{X} V_1^T, \tag{24}$$

where $\tilde{X} = \tilde{X}^T \succeq 0$ is solved from the reduced-order ARE

$$\tilde{A}^T\tilde{X} + \tilde{X}\tilde{A} + \tilde{C}_1^T\tilde{C}_1 - \tilde{X}\tilde{M}\tilde{X} = 0 \tag{25}$$

with $\tilde{A} = V_1^T A V_1$, $\tilde{C}_1 = C_1 V_1$ and $\tilde{M} = V_1^T M V_1$. Moreover, eigenvalues of the closed-loop state matrix $A - MX$ are given by Λ_2 and those of $\tilde{A} - \tilde{M}\tilde{X}$.

Proof. From [15], the null space of X is verified as an A-invariant subspace contained in the null space of C_1^T. Given $C_1^T \in span(V_1)$ and V_2 being the eigenspace of A, it follows that $C_1 V_2 = 0$ and thus $XV_2 = 0$. Therefore, pre- and post-multiplying (17) with V^T and V yields

$$\begin{bmatrix} V_1^T(A^TX + XA + C_1^TC_1 - XMX)V_1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} = 0. \tag{26}$$

Notice that $V_1V_1^T + V_2V_2^T = I$, we can write

$$V_1^TA^TXV_1 = V_1^TA^T(V_1V_1^T + V_2V_2^T)XV_1 = \tilde{A}^T\tilde{X},$$

and by the similar logic $V_1^TXMXV_1 = \tilde{X}\tilde{M}\tilde{X}$ with $\tilde{X} = V_1^TXV_1$. Therefore, the only non-zero entry in (26) and then (17) is equivalent to (25). In addition, pre- and post-multiplying $\tilde{X}$ with V_1 and V_1^T yields

$$V_1\tilde{X}V_1^T = (I - V_2V_2^T)X(I - V_2V_2^T) = X,$$

which proves (24). The eigenvalues of $A - MX$ can be simply verified by a coordinate transformation of V and V^T. □

Notice that to find a low-rank solution X, one would need to compute the eigenspace V_1, which can be done by using Krylov-subspace based algorithms in $\mathcal{O}(n\kappa^2)$ time [16]. Including the $\mathcal{O}(\kappa^3)$ complexity for (25), the total complexity for solving X is also $\mathcal{O}(n\kappa^2)$. The design in Theorem IV.1, therefore, can be very cheap and efficient if $\kappa \ll n$, and Λ_1 contains only the first κ eigenvalues with largest or smallest magnitude. In practice, this requirement is not restrictive. For example, in consensus problems where the state matrix A is usually symmetric and Hurwitz, one can choose C_1 to map a few smallest eigenvalues that decide the speed of consensus.

B. Hamiltonian-Based Approximation

If $A \neq A^T$, one may consider an approximation for X as follows. Recall the stable invariant subspace of H defined in (21). Let $\Lambda_\kappa^- \in \mathbb{R}^{\kappa\times\kappa}$ be a principal submatrix of Λ^-, and denote the corresponding subspace partitions by $Y_\kappa \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times\kappa}$ and $Z_\kappa \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times\kappa}$, i.e.

$$\Lambda^- = \begin{bmatrix} \Lambda_\kappa^- & \\ & \Lambda_{\bar{\kappa}}^- \end{bmatrix}, \; Y = \begin{bmatrix} Y_\kappa & Y_{\bar{\kappa}} \end{bmatrix}, \; Z = \begin{bmatrix} Z_\kappa & Z_{\bar{\kappa}} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Using the lower-dimensional Hamiltonian subspaces Y_κ and Z_κ, one can construct an approximate solution for (17) as

$$\bar{X} = Z_\kappa(Z_\kappa^TY_\kappa)^{-1}Z_\kappa^T. \tag{27}$$

This approximation form has been previously proposed in [11], although the choice of the κ eigenvalues contained in Λ_κ^- was not determined. In contrast, motivated by conventional frequency-weighted model reduction, we decide the eigenvalues in Λ_κ^- from the minimization problem

$$\text{minimize} \quad \|(X - \bar{X})W_x\|_{\mathcal{H}_2} \quad , \tag{28}$$

where $W_x = (sI - A + MX)^{-1}B_1$ is a frequency weight representing the closed-loop output response.[1] Due to the nonconvex nature of the model reduction, it is intractable to find an exact minimum for (28). Therefore, we approach (28) by an upper bound minimization derived as follows.

Theorem IV.2. *Denote $E_\kappa = Z_{\bar{\kappa}} - Z_\kappa(Z_\kappa^TY_\kappa)^{-1}Z_\kappa^TY_{\bar{\kappa}}$, the objective function in (28) is upper bounded by*

$$\|(X - \bar{X})W_x\|_{\mathcal{H}_2} \leq \epsilon\|E_\kappa\|_F, \tag{29}$$

where $\epsilon := \sqrt{\sum_{i=\kappa+1}^n C_{ii}}$, and $\mathcal{C} \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$ is a Cauchy-like matrix defined by

$$\mathcal{C}_{ij} := -\frac{1}{\lambda_i^- + \lambda_j^-}[Y^{-1}B_1B_1^TY^{-T}]_{ij}. \tag{30}$$

Proof. By applying the definition of $\mathcal{H}_2$ norm, the objective function in (28) can be rewritten as

$$\|(X - \bar{X})W_x\|_{\mathcal{H}_2} = \|(X - \bar{X})\Phi^{\frac{1}{2}}\|_F,$$

where $\Phi = \Phi^{\frac{1}{2}}\Phi^{\frac{T}{2}}$ is the solution of the Lyapunov equation

$$(A - MX)\Phi + \Phi(A - MX)^T + B_1B_1^T = 0.$$

[1] All the results presented in this subsection will hold for $\bar{S}$ by replacing (28) with $\|W_s(S - \bar{S})\|_{\mathcal{H}_2}$ and input frequency weight $W_s = C_1(sI - A + SM_s)^{-1}$.

Note that from (21) we can find $A - MX = Y\Lambda^{-}Y^{-1}$, which means Λ^{-} contains all the eigenvalues of closed-loop state matrix $A - MX$ on the eigenspace Y. Hence, the controllability Gramian Φ follows directly from [17] as

$$\Phi = Y\mathcal{C}Y^T.$$

Also given the expansion of the error matrix $(X - \bar{X})$ as

$$(X - \bar{X}) = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & Z_{\bar{\kappa}} - Z_\kappa (Z_\kappa^T Y_\kappa)^{-1} Z_\kappa^T Y_{\bar{\kappa}} \end{bmatrix} Y^{-1},$$

the norm $\|(X - \bar{X})\Phi^{\frac{1}{2}}\|_F$ follows

$$\begin{aligned} \|(X - \bar{X})\Phi^{\frac{1}{2}}\|_F &= \sqrt{tr[(X - \bar{X})\Phi(X - \bar{X})]} \\ &= \sqrt{tr(E_\kappa \mathcal{C}_{\kappa+1:n,\kappa+1:n} E_\kappa^T)} = \|E_\kappa \mathcal{C}^{\frac{1}{2}}_{\kappa+1:n,\kappa+1:n}\|_F \\ &\leq \|E_\kappa\|_F \|\mathcal{C}^{\frac{1}{2}}_{\kappa+1:n,\kappa+1:n}\|_F = \|E_\kappa\|_F \sqrt{tr(\mathcal{C}_{\kappa+1:n,\kappa+1:n})}. \end{aligned}$$

Expanding the trace above then yields (29). □

From Theorem IV.2, the norm of interest $\|(X - \bar{X})W_x\|_F$ is linearly bounded by a scalar ϵ. The minimization in (28) can then be approached by minimizing ϵ with respect to the choice of Λ_κ^-. It is worth emphasizing that the value of $\mathcal{C}_{ii}$ is inversely proportional to the magnitude of the closed-loop eigenvalue λ_i^- for $i = \kappa + 1, ..., n$. Therefore, one heuristic way for minimizing ϵ can be to order the eigenvalues in Λ^- by $0 < |\lambda_1^-| \leq ... \leq |\lambda_n^-|$. As a result, eigenvalues from $\lambda_{\kappa+1}^-$ to λ_n^- will have larger magnitudes, and thus both $\mathcal{C}_{ii}$ and ϵ will be small positive numbers. This leaves us with Λ_κ^- containing the first κ eigenvalues with the smallest magnitudes. Hence, computation of $\bar{X}$ will require only the eigenspace of these first κ eigenvalues, which can be completed in $\mathcal{O}(n\kappa^2)$ time. In practice, the design of $\bar{X}$ can be further facilitated if there exists an eigenvalue gap

$$0 < |\lambda_1^-| \leq ... \leq |\lambda_\kappa^-| \ll |\lambda_{\kappa+1}^-| \leq ... \leq |\lambda_n^-|, \qquad (31)$$

which means that closed-loop network is naturally clustered into κ coherent groups [1]. Under this condition, ϵ becomes nearly zero, indicating a close matching between X and $\bar{X}$. The computational complexity for $\bar{X}$ can be further reduced if κ is a sufficiently small number. It should be noted that this design is inherently different than the case in Section IV.A as there the eigenspace is computed from the open-loop state matrix A while in this case it follows directly from the closed-loop state matrix.

The approximate solution $\bar{X}$, however, does not come without a drawback. In general, $\bar{X}$ can only stabilize $A - M\bar{X}$ over the subspace Y_κ, and hence a small κ will not necessarily stabilize an unstable plant. Therefore, we briefly comment on the stabilizability condition of $\bar{X}$ to conclude this section. Some useful properties of $\bar{X}$ are summarized as follows.

Lemma IV.3. *[11] The approximate solution $\bar{X}$ given by (27) satisfies $\bar{X} \preceq X$, and its residue can be written as*

$$\mathcal{R}(\bar{X}) := A^T\bar{X} + \bar{X}A + C_1^T C_1 - \bar{X}M\bar{X} = \bar{C}_1^T\bar{C}_1, \quad (32)$$

where $\bar{C}_1^T = [I - Z_\kappa (Z_\kappa^T Y_\kappa)^{-1} Y_\kappa^T] C_1^T$.

A simple stability condition then follows immediately from Lemma IV.3.

Lemma IV.4. *The approximate solution $\bar{X}$ is stabilizing if $C_1^T C_1 - \bar{C}_1^T \bar{C}_1 = \bar{C}^T\bar{C} \succeq 0$, and $(\bar{C}, A)$ has no unobservable modes on the imaginary axis.*

Proof. By moving $\bar{C}_1^T\bar{C}_1$ to the left hand side of (32), (32) becomes an ARE in the form of $A^T\bar{X} + \bar{X}A + \bar{C}^T\bar{C} - \bar{X}M\bar{X} = 0$ if $\bar{C}^T\bar{C}$ exists for a real-valued matrix $\bar{C}$. The stabilizability for $\bar{X}$ then follows from standard conditions in [15] based on $(\bar{C}, A)$. □

Lemma IV.4 implies that one sufficient condition for stabilizing an unstable system is to choose a positive-definite matrix $C_1^T C_1$ with a large norm. The flip side, however, is that this would lead to a larger control effort, thereby amplifying the measurement noise in the $\mathcal{H}_2$ design. An alternative is to gradually increase the value of κ, and check for closed-loop stability. Lemma IV.4 can thus be used as a stability test, requiring computation of only Y_κ and Z_κ without any need for checking the eigenvalues of $A - M\bar{X}$.

V. Numerical Example

In this section we verify the performance of our proposed design using a large-scale network of second-order oscillators. This type of networks can often model the electro-mechanical swing dynamics of synchronous generators in power system networks. The plant G_{22} is described by $n_s = 500$ oscillators that are interconnected by the network topology shown in Fig. 0. Each oscillator is modeled by

$$\ddot{x}_i = -d_i\dot{x}_i + u_i + \sum_{j=1, j\neq i}^{n_s} a_{ij}(x_j - x_i), \quad i = 1, ..., n_s,$$

where x_i represents the phase angle, $\dot{x}_i$ is the angular frequency, u_i is a scalar control input, $d_i > 0$ is the damping factor for the i^{th} oscillator, and $a_{ij} \geq 0$ represents the connection strength between the i^{th} and j^{th} oscillators. The total order of this system is $n = 2n_s = 1000$. We assume the states x_i and $\dot{x}_i$ to be both measurable, i.e., $y_i = \begin{bmatrix} x_i & \dot{x}_i \end{bmatrix}^T$. The design parameters C_1, B_1, D_{12} and D_{21} are chosen as identity matrices with compatible dimensions. We define four groups of oscillators indexed as $\mathcal{V}_1 = \{1, ..., 125\}$, $\mathcal{V}_2 = \{126, ..., 250\}$, $\mathcal{V}_3 = \{251, ..., 375\}$ and $\mathcal{V}_4 = \{376, ..., 500\}$, where inside the groups oscillators are densely connected while the groups themselves are sparsely connected, as shown in Fig. 0. This results in four naturally coherent clusters. The grouping needed for constructing the constraint set $\mathcal{S}$ is based on these four clusters. The projection matrices P_u and P_y are then constructed using their corresponding subsets $\mathcal{I}^u$ and $\mathcal{I}^y$.

To verify our proposed simplification on design of K_{opt}, we consider applying the Hamiltonian-based approximation with $\kappa = 4$, and compare it with the optimal solution for K_{opt} in Table I. As is obvious from the numbers shown, solving the approximate approach requires significantly less computation time, while still providing a close performance match to the optimal controller by their respective closed-loop metric $\|f(G, K)\|_{\mathcal{H}_2}$. It is worth mentioning that the negligible performance loss 0.0002 here is facilitated by the 4 smallest dominant eigenvalues resulting from the natural clustering of the open-loop network shown in Fig. 0. If the open-loop



Figure 0: Network topology for a 500*-node network.*

Table I: Performance results

K_{opt}	Optimal (X, S)	Approximate $(\bar{X}, \bar{S})$
Computation time	32.6009 sec	1.5795 sec
Normalized $\mathcal{H}_2$ norm	1	1.0002

system is not naturally clustered, then the performance loss can increase. The computation time, however, will not change significantly.

We finally illustrate the scalability of our design by varying the number of nodes from 40 to 5000, corresponding to a system order of 80 to 10000. The resulting computation costs for solving the Hamiltonian-based approximation versus that of the optimal case are plotted in Fig. 1. The approximate approach starts with a more expensive cost than the optimal one at $n = 80$. This is due to the fact that the subspace-based methods for solving the approximation is iterative, and thus is less efficient for a small n. However, as n scales up, the approximate approach becomes remarkably cheaper than the optimal case. For example, at $n = 4000$, solving the optimal case is already beyond our computing capacity, while the approximate approach can be completed within only 26 seconds. This verifies the tractability of our design in handling large-scale networks.



Figure 1: Scalability results for computation time

VI. Conclusion

In this paper we presented a hierarchical $\mathcal{H}_2$ optimal controller that provides benefits for both design and implementation for large-scale network dynamic systems. The advantage of the hierarchical structure is that it satisfies quadratic invariance constraint for any generic network model, and allows a convex reformulation for the original problem, which is in a standard $\mathcal{H}_2$ form. Our future work will be to increase the efficiency of this approach by posing the hierarchical structure as a design variable.

References

[1] N. Xue and A. Chakrabortty, "Optimal Control of Large-Scale Networks using Clustering Based Projections," *submitted to Transactions on Automatic Control*, available online: http://arxiv.org/abs/1609.05265.

[2] P. Kokotovic, H. K. Khalil, and J. Oreilly, *Singular Perturbation Methods in Control: Analysis and Design*, SIAM, 1999.

[3] B. Moore, "Principal Component Analysis in Linear Systems: Controllability, Observability, and Model Reduction," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 26(1), pp. 17-32, 1981.

[4] G. Obinata and B. D. Anderson, *Model Reduction for Control System Design*, Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.

[5] D. D. Siljak, *Decentralized Control of Complex Systems*, Courier Corporation, 2011.

[6] M. Rotkowitz and S. Lall,"A Characterization of Convex Problems in Decentralized Control," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 51(2), pp. 274-286, Feb, 2006.

[7] A. Lamperski and L. Lessard, "Optimal Decentralized State-Feedback Control with Sparsity and Delays," *Automatica*, vol. 58, pp. 143-151, 2015.

[8] S. Sabau and N. C. Martins, "Youla-Like Parametrizations Subject to QI Subspace Constraints," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 59(6), pp. 1411-1422, June 2014.

[9] F. Lin, M. Fardad, and M. R. Jovanovic, "Design of Optimal Sparse Feedback Gains via the Alternating Direction Method of Multipliers," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 58(9), pp. 2426-2431, 2013.

[10] N. Xue and A. Chakrabortty, "LQG Control of Large Networks: A Clustering-Based Approach," *in proceedings of the American Control Conference (ACC)*, Seattle, WA, 2017.

[11] P. Benner and Z. Bujanovi, "On the Solution of Large-Scale Algebraic Riccati Equations by Using Low-Dimensional Invariant Subspaces," *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, vol. 488, pp. 430-459, 2016.

[12] Y. S. Wang and N. Matni, "Localized LQG Optimal Control for Large-Scale Systems," *2016 American Control Conference (ACC)*, pp. 1954-1961, Boston, MA, USA, 2016.

[13] D. H. Nguyen and S. Hara, "Hierarchical Decentralized Stabilization for Networked Dynamical Systems by LQR Selective Pole Shift," *IFAC Proceedings Volumes*, vol. 47(3), pp. 5778-5783, 2014.

[14] T. Sadamoto, T. Ishizaki, and J. I. Imura, "Hierarchical Distributed Control for Networked Linear Systems," *53rd IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, pp. 2447-2452, Los Angeles, CA, 2014.

[15] K. Zhou and J. C. Doyle, *Essentials of Robust Control*, vol. 180, Prentice Hall Upper Saddle River, NJ, 1998.

[16] G. H. Golub and C. F. Van Loan, *Matrix Computations*, JHU Press, vol. 3, 2012.

[17] A. C. Antoulas, *Approximation of Large-Scale Dynamical Systems*, SIAM, 2005.